**New Frontiers Preproposal Conference Questions and Answers**

QUESTION: I believe in the Discovery Program there's an opportunity for the Evaluation Board to ask questions of the proposal team at some point, if they need clarifications. Will this also be the case in the New Frontiers Program?

DR. BOHLIN: That's an option, but it's rarely done in practice. No, it will not be the case. I tell you, we've done that on a few rare occasions. It greatly complicates the process from our side in terms of how long the Evaluation Team has to stay in session. The very careful process we have to follow in notifying the PI of a question, giving them time to respond. In other words, we don't do this in real time. We have to provide it in writing. The PI has to be given a chance to formulate a response and then respond. We're not planning to have oral discussions, and it's very rare that we allow questions and answers. So what that really means is your proposals really have to speak for themselves. They have to be complete in and of themselves. Don't expect a dialogue with NASA.

QUESTION: This question is about preliminary examination. For both access and for the cost of, for example, making thin sections or some kind of gray mounts to be studied by either microscope, SEM, this applies probably both to lunar and comet sample returns. So is access and the cost at JSC?

DR. ALLEN: Those are in excess of what was laid out here. If your sample return requires thin sections or some other kind of handling to support PET, those are additional costs, and it's your choice as to how those are done.

QUESTION: Well, does it have to be done at JSC?

DR. ALLEN: Not for preliminary examination. I'm not laying that as a ground rule right now. We can work that out. The discretion that the PIs have over their 25 percent of the sample is not well-worked out at this point, and we're going to have to negotiate that. And, of course, it's different for comets. We do currently run a thin section operation at JSC. I can't guarantee whether or not that will still be running at however many years from now this mission is going.

QUESTION: On the third bullet down [Schafer presentation; Page entitled NASA Launch Services] you say "dual compatible with both families of launch vehicles within the proposed performance class." I don't believe that language is in the AO. Let me make sure I understand the statement first. If you have like a Delta IV vehicle, and an Atlas V vehicle being put forward in the same class, you're saying that the proposed investigation vehicle has got to be compatible with both of those launch vehicles?

MR. SCHAFER: Yes, that's what we're saying. Within that proposed class, like an intermediate class, the Delta IV and Atlas V as you suggested, for this example, let's say not the heavy class, but the Delta IV, Atlas V, you should be compatible with both launch vehicles during this early phase, and for purposes of this AO. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Okay. Maybe during the break you can show me the language in the AO that makes the statement?

MR. SCHAFER: Okay. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Because right now, the way it seems to be worded, you can go to any vehicle within the AO and demonstrate your compatibility with that vehicle and you're fine. Am I just misinterpreting the language of the AO?

MR. SCHAFER: Okay. I believe it's on the first page of the ELV portion of the AO, but I'll be glad to show it to you. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: I wanted to follow-up on that question, and I have another one. Your tables show that the capability within a class is different as far as launch capability between a Delta IV and an Atlas V, so are you insisting that your mission be compatible with the lowest launch capability within that class?

MR. SCHAFER: I'm not sure I understand what you're asking, but if there --

QUESTION: An Atlas V can launch more than a Delta IV within a given class?

MR. SCHAFER: Right.

QUESTION: Are you saying that you have to have a launch mass that's compatible with both Delta IV and an Atlas V?

MR. SCHAFER: Also, there's the Delta IV and Atlas V heavy option, as well. So I guess there could be a situation where you would cut across two classes.

QUESTION: You show for all versions of Delta IVs and Atlas Vs within a class, the same cost. Can you speak to that?

MR. SCHAFER: For the purposes of this AO, those are the costs that we were asking you to adhere to. And I believe that's to a June `09 launch. If you have a different time frame, the time will dictate. Like if you're running `010 or `08, that will change the profile slightly, but those costs are applied to both Delta IV and Atlas V.

QUESTION: Would you anticipate at a later date that the true cost of the launch vehicle based on the number of solids required would come into effect?

MR. SCHAFER: The cost of the launch service is dependent on many things, including the time you're launching and the particular configuration. But again, for the purposes of this AO, we're asking you not to try to discern the difference between a Delta IV and an Atlas V, say within the intermediate class.

QUESTION: Is Sea Launch excluded because it's considered non-U.S., or because there's no launch services agreement between NASA and Sea Launch?

MR. SCHAFER: It is considered a non-U.S. service. Again, we've shown in the AO the ones that we are considering at this point.

QUESTION: I guess I have a follow-up question to an earlier question. Could you elaborate on what the word "compatible" means? It says "dual compatible", but I'm still not understanding exactly what that means in the statement.

MR. SCHAFER: I'm just thinking how to say this here at the microphone. I might be able to address it better as a written question, what we consider compatible. My interpretation is that you could go on either launch vehicle, whether it's Delta IV or Atlas V, if you're considering a mission in that class. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: So again, I'd like to follow-up on that because I'm a little confused. In this third bullet from one of the previous questions [Schafer Presentation, Page entitled NASA Launch Services], you say that that's compatible within the proposed performance class. And then one of your answers was that you could see that because they're not -- not all the vehicles are equal, and an Atlas V launch is more than a Delta IV, you might go to the Delta IV heavy, so now you've crossed classes. So I don't understand how crossing classes is compatible with that, and then which cost are you using? So I guess it's how do you deal with the fact that there are different performance levels between the two families within the same class.

MR. SCHAFER: Because there's different performance levels for the launch vehicles, if you cross -- to be dual compatible, if you're in a situation where it crosses classes because of your mass and your performance requirements, you would need to show that you're compatible with, let's say for example, a Delta IV heavy, and an Atlas V 51. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Can you talk a little bit more about the wording you want to see in these Letters of Commitment? I know each AO seems to be getting more and more strict on this. And what I'm really trying to get to is, basically NASA can say that whatever is selected through here is an approved program, because they still have to go to Congress every year for budgets for New Frontiers. Now you're asking a foreign partner to commit to funding in FY07 or 08 or something, to provide hardware, and they have to go for it on a yearly basis. So what kind of words do you want to see from the foreign, or in fact, it doesn't even have to be foreign. It can be a U.S. partner, or it can be another office with NASA. I mean, I can't see Code Y coming out with a letter that says I will provide funding.

MS. RAUSCH: This has come up a lot.

QUESTION: What kind of words do you want to see in a letter, and what kind of words does Mr. Perry want to see when he evaluates this to say you're compliant?

MS. RAUSCH: We would like to see a firmly committed letter along the lines of if selected by NASA, we intend to fund the following instrument. Of course, we have an escape clause in all of our agreements, so do they. And typically in the letter, they will say, of course, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. We all know that. We all live year-to-year, except for a few exceptions that I know of on the international scene, based on our Parliament, our Congress. And that's a fact of life, but we will use our best efforts to have the funding available, if selected. And NASA has been asked from time to time to provide those kinds of letters, and we do that. Typically, more and more the foreign partner, for example, with DLR with Germany, we have found that they are doing in the most recent, I think it was SMEX AO, they are doing their own peer review and deciding which instrument coming into the NASA process that they will support. And that's the one that has the strongly worded endorsement letter, and four other letters that we got from DLR for other instruments did not have those words. They said we must inform you that, in fact, this is not our highest priority. If funded, we will try to seek the funding that is required to carry out this project if you guys select it at NASA. But this is not our highest priority, so DLR is being very explicit about what they're prepared to fund, and what they're not prepared to fund, because they have an initial triage process on their side of the fence. So we would just like to see something other than thank you for your interest, here's our letterhead, and we're not committed to anything. We have been left at the altar a number of times by international partners, and it's been difficult for us to work through the issues where we are counting on an international partner, and then they're not there and we are. So we would rather have the commitment up front, than after Phase A, or after Phase B, when the agreements are typically completed. Sometimes we have an LOA, a Letter of Agreement, for the study phase, Active Concept Study, and then we lead to a higher level agency commitment at the MOU where the administrator would sign with his foreign counterpart agency.

QUESTION: I have a question just about individuals, individual scientists, because it says you don't fund research, but you do buy goods or services.

MS. RAUSCH: Right.

QUESTION: And if we have a foreign scientist who's necessary for a particular project, is it that he has to get funding from his institution, or can we do a subcontract through a U.S. university say, or something like that?

MS. RAUSCH: I guess I don't understand. What would his role be? Would it be scientific collaboration, or is he providing detectors, and providing --

QUESTION: No, no instruments. It's scientific expertise which is, to me, research too.

MS. RAUSCH: Yes, research. That should be on a no exchange of funds basis, and not a subcontract.

QUESTION: So that's a much harder thing to do for individuals.

MS. RAUSCH: Yes, it is. It is. But that's what we're looking for. We're looking for significant cooperation. We're not looking for peace parts. We're looking for an opportunity to have a

cooperative program, a handshake, we meet at the interface. This is the classic way that NASA has carried out its cooperation for about 40 years, and we'd like to see it continue, and not degrade into a messy environment where we're simply subcontracting back and forth between governments. That's not NASA policy at this time, and it hasn't been.

QUESTION: Right. I understand that. But this is a case where it's a small part of the overall budget, obviously, where we're funding an individual with particular expertise. And even in that case, even though you might want to seek government-to-government collaboration, this is a case where you could -- it's like buying their services, if you look at it that way.

MS. RAUSCH: Well, we don't look at it that way. That's the point, we don't look at it that way.

QUESTION: In the section on Sample Return Missions with foreign collaborators, there's a designation about prorating the sample set and sending a portion of it to the non-U.S. collaborators.

MS. RAUSCH: I think it was no more than one-third.

QUESTION: Right.

MS. RAUSCH: It's in the AO, yes.

QUESTION: Does your office get into the details of how that is actually going to be done? Is that within your bailiwick?

MS. RAUSCH: No. We would simply have that provision stated in the agreement, that not to exceed one-third of a total sample size. We don't get into the weeds. That's an implementation detail worked out between the parties.

QUESTION: Maybe we could return to this launch vehicle category discussion. Well, the thing that was confusing is that you have this intermediate category of Delta IV mediums and Atlas Vs. One has a bigger payload, and some missions may fit into the smaller one. Another one cannot do it, and will have to go to the bigger one in that category. Then they're not satisfying that dual compatibility, and it's kind of penalizing them for fitting in only one of the ones designated as a kind of intermediate capability. And, therefore, you'd have to also say well, we may need a heavier one, and that's a big budget hit. So, I mean, it seems to me to be inconsistent with the way the AO was originally written; that you have a menu to choose from, and two of them cost the same, even though one lifts more than the other.

MR. SCHAFER: That's a good question that you bring up. The launch vehicles aren't identical, and there are differences between them. But the issue is that at this early phase in the program, especially at the early levels of the AO process, we don't want to eliminate one vehicle and go to a point solution. There's no guarantee that both these service providers are going to be out there in `09. I don't have any particular insight, but that's a long time from now. And to eliminate one vehicle and go to a point solution to another vehicle when we're in this early phase, is just not consistent with where we're going with the ELV Program. In addition, the requirements for your launch are going to be competed between the two service providers. And to go to a single point

solution at this phase is just not consistent with that. So I understand your question. It could be where you've got one launch vehicle that is going to maybe lower cost, and the other launch vehicle is going to be higher cost, but it jumps you up into the larger performance class. But at this early phase, you're just going to have to try to be compatible with both vehicles. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: My sense is that the whole room is perplexed by your answer, so let me try a question. This would be a hypothetical. Suppose a proposal has a mission that fits on an Atlas V, but it doesn't fit on the allegedly comparable Delta IV. Okay. So we're interpreting what you're saying as a requirement that we would have to make that mission also compatible with a Delta IV heavy, and we would have to book the cost for that in the proposal appropriately. Right? So the real question that this room has is, the cost hit that the proposal would have to swallow for the Delta IV heavy compatibility that's required by this dual compatible requirement. Did I get that right? Is that what everybody is worried about? So the question is, does the AO process require that we book the cost for the heavier class of launch vehicle in order to maintain this dual compatibility requirement?

MR. SCHAFER: Again, that's a good question. I can't tell you how to write your proposal, but to be dual compatible, if you're in that particular part of the performance where only an Atlas V 51 or a Delta IV heavy meet your requirements, then I would say you would want to book keep the cost of the heavy requirement. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: I would like to suggest that later on in the afternoon maybe you could look at the very first page of the launch vehicle appendix. The wordings are very specific. Your answer, in my opinion, is different than what the wording says, so I think if there is time in the afternoon, you could display that part, and discuss exactly whether you are following to the letter of what you've written up.

MR. SCHAFER: I'd be glad to do that. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: With regard to distribution of samples, there's a limit of 25 percent to go to the science team, and 30 percent to go to foreign investigators. If you have foreign investigators on your science team, out of which pot do they get their sample?

DR. MORGAN: The first thing we need to do is clearly constrain the question. You've giving us a "what-if", and the what-if that we have as part of this deal, we have a foreign contribution to the program, and foreign investigators, and they want a fraction of -- they are requesting as part of that, that we agree to return a fraction of that material to the host country, or the country that's providing the contribution. Is that correct?

QUESTION: Yes.

DR. MORGAN: All right. So Step One is that you have proposed this. Your mission has been accepted, and Code I has negotiated a deal and agreed with you. This is the approximate amount that it represents the size of the foreign contribution. So that given, that means that after it's been returned to the loading dock of Building 31 at JSC, that at some point in time that some agreed upon fraction will go to the host country, to the foreign country that provided the support. That's in the AO. All right. Your next question is your foreign Co-Is, which part of the sample would they have access to. And I think that would depend on what Code I negotiates. Where is Carl? Are you familiar with that section of the AO?

DR. ALLEN: I'm familiar with what it says, but I think the question, the PI basically has a lot of discretion over a quarter of the sample.

DR. MORGAN: Yes, on his science team.

QUESTION: Well, let me ask it this way. If the PI takes his quarter and distributes it to all his domestic co-investigators, can his foreign co-investigators still get a sample out of that other 30 percent?

DR. MORGAN: I think we're going to have to take this under advisement.

DR. ALLEN: I agree. I'd like this submitted as a written question so that we can work, and not make a statement like this on the fly. I'm just not willing to do that at this point.

QUESTION: Mr. Figueroa mentioned the importance of past performance. And in your outline of the total cost, technical cost and management, I didn't really see, unless it's in the feasibility portion, how is past performance going to be worked into the evaluation criteria?

MR. PERRY: It's one of many considerations that we make when we're doing the TMC review. We have been moving towards doing more of this for some time, but in essence, as Mr. Figueroa talked earlier today, we're going to be looking at the teams involved, the integrated team for giving a proposal, and the past performance record is just part of what we look at. It's one of many pieces, and it's done in a manner that considers big pluses, as well as the lack thereof. We will look at what the total previous performance has been. Does that answer?

QUESTION: I guess when I listened to Dr. Figueroa, it sounded like he was more talking about past performance with regards to cost cap. And what you're giving me is more of an answer --

MR. PERRY: It includes cost.

QUESTION: You mentioned this Project Management Data Plan or whatever that was. That doesn't have to be in this first proposal in detail. Right?

MR. KNOPF: There's some level of detail that needs to be in it. It's called out in the AO, I believe, so as long as you follow the letter of the AO, there'll be information in there as far as what is necessary.

QUESTION: There was a host of questions this morning about the issue of dual compatibility, and answers that were given which we would like to be clarified relative to what is written in the AO. In the AO attachment - I forgot the exact title of the attachment, but there is an attachment that talks about launch services. And in this attachment there is a set of statements about dual compatibility. Could you clarify what that means?

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Yes. The intent of the dual compatibility is one that we're in a unique place in the ELV world, where the vehicles have been designed to enable flight on either system. We've never had a capability in this market class or in this performance class that had more than one supplier. And so, as the Administration's perspective, so it's not just a NASA policy, it's an Administration activity, we've been looking to maximize dual compatibility. What that means is, right now today, I understand how an Atlas V 51 and a Delta IV heavy, or an Atlas V heavy, that there is a perceived price difference between those two. The place we're at today is I can give my customer Code S, no assurance that both capabilities will be available or viable when we get into the out years of when this mission is planned for flight. And so our intent has been to have the customers in the payloads assured that they can fly on either system. Our process is such that once a mission is actually down selected into Phase B, we then go off with a competitive task order to both vendors, assuming both vendors are there. So in looking at the words, the intent had been what we'll likely do is put out an amendment I think, is what I talked to Mr. Perry about - was to make it clear that what we're looking for is that you're going to need to be dual compatible. Now if Mr. Figueroa wants to entertain an ability to have an alternate proposal, or a risk assessment of what it takes to do a particular system, you can do so, but you are going to need to understand that whatever is selected at Phase B is going to be competitively awarded, or competed. And so if you want to do a point solution, that's a risk the program will be taking, because we will not assure either system to be available, so the only way to mitigate that is to define a spacecraft that can fly on either system. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: So if I read the current AO, it says that the assumption of a specific intermediate class launch vehicle configuration as part of the AO proposal will not guarantee the proposed launch vehicle configuration will be selected for award.

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Correct. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Unless there is a firm rationale to consider only one source. This rationale should be clearly explained in the proposal. If we submit a proposal including such a rationale, would that be considered from our --?

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Yes. What we're going to look to do is in the third paragraph where it says, "Proposers should seek to be dual compatible with both vehicle families." We're going to issue a correction that proposers should be dual compatible with both vehicle families. So from our perspective, what we're going to look for is that you enable your proposal, your primary proposal needs to identify that you can be compatible with both, and what it takes. If there's some compelling rationale you want to be considered that says why you can only have one vehicle, you can present that and provide the rationale, with no assurance that we'll be able to buy that. Right

now from my vantage point, there's no performance of technical discriminator that either system to grant a different configuration with different prices, but price is not the discriminator from a technical perspective. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: But in the current data now, there is a significant performance difference between some of the launch vehicles that are listed in your intermediate launch vehicle class, significant performance differences.

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Correct. What we're looking for is dual compatibility between vendors. And it also says you're to look to find your minimum ELV-type configuration that meets your requirements. So, i.e., if an intermediate meets your requirements, you can identify it. You're just going to bear the risk that if we then go and do a competition, and the smaller version of an ELV is selected, that's what you're going to get. You're going to get whatever your requirement drives you to. If you design to a single point, design to a specific vehicle, our process will require us to go and compete that. And that means you will be at risk, and we will give that counsel to Code S as they go through their selection, that that's a risk they will be taking. What we're looking for is a compliant proposal, would require you to have a solution that is dual compatible against both families. And included, you can add what we would desire to do is a single vehicle solution, and here's why. But we need to see the dual compatibility, what the impacts of dual compatibility are, again based on a technical capability. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: So let me just ask you one more time, just for my own edification. So if we submit a proposal which includes a launch capability of only one class, and with a rationale why that class is needed for the proposal --

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Yes, let me be clear. The issue is not class, it's multiple vendors. You need to have compatibility, so if you've got compatibility within a class, that's what we're looking for. If you're intermediate class, as long as you can fly on what qualifies as an intermediate in either vehicle, that's fine. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Okay. So I'm getting more confused. In the intermediate class, there are two types of launch vehicles. One is Delta, one is Atlas.

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Correct. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: If we submit a proposal in which we provide a rationale in which one of the two types of launch vehicles is recommended, would that be considered compliant?

MR. FIGUEROA: I don't think we would have enough information to declare the proposal not compliant. It wouldn't be fair, but it needs to be part of the risk assessment based on the information you provide. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MS. PONIATOWSKI: You need to identify your ability to retain dual compatibility, so what I'm understanding the issue is, it's not where there's an equal capability. It's an Atlas V 51, and then moving to the next capability, because Atlas V 51 has more performance than the smallest of a Delta capability. What you need to understand is you can propose to that, but you're going to need to be able to be compatible with the next class, with the Delta IV heavy, if that's your compatible vehicle. We need you to be compatible with both vehicle families. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

CLARIFICATION: The other point of clarification is, Ms. Poniatowski was talking about the third paragraph in the document she was looking at. That's the ELV Launch Services document in the Program Library, not the AO itself, where the third paragraph had the words as she read. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Okay. I want to ask about a specific example. Suppose I have a spacecraft which needs to launch off of a medium, but requires the performance of the Atlas. And I can make my spacecraft compatible with either an Atlas or a Delta, that's no problem. But since the only Delta that has the performance I need is the heavy, do I need to carry the cost of the heavy in the proposal, or can I identify that my single solution is the Atlas, and that would be a future lien, perhaps, against the mission?

MS. PONIATOWSKI: What we do is when I give him budget estimates, if you're in the intermediate, we give them the largest profile that goes with the largest vehicle. And so I would suggest how you would propose it from a cost standpoint, you can identify that it's the intermediate class dollars, and you understand that since you're targeting the V 51, part of your proposal includes the cost lien, that you've got the money available that should the other vehicle be selected, you've got that covered. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: So you're saying I have to include the cost of the heavy?

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Yes, my reason is this; the market has gotten so volatile, there is absolutely no assurance that in this performance class, both vehicles will be there. So I appreciate the frustration it has for you all, I have the same with our alternative access to station cargo developers. They've got the exact same information. They're fighting the exact same battle. My problem is, we're at a place where I can't let people believe there will be for sure two different vehicles in this range. I believe in the end by the time we get to `09 and 2010, unless there's a significant change in the market, that there will only be one viable provider. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MR. FIGUEROA: I think the problem, where you guys are coming from is that the lien is an enormous number. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Yes.

MR. FIGUEROA: And in the cost cap environment that becomes a huge driver. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MS. PONIATOWSKI: I understand. Right.

MR. FIGUEROA: So I don't know what we can tell them to make them feel any better.

QUESTION: Well, can you provide some relief?

MR. FIGUEROA: I don't know the answer to that at this point. That's something we're going to have to talk about, given the environment we're in. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MS. PONIATOWSKI: I didn't think the answer was going to be on that anyone wanted to hear. But again, what we're trying to do is we're trying to do a balance, you know, from a risk standpoint - what is it that we can believe can be out there so you design in payloads that are going to have an ability to get access to space? And I can't assume that both providers will be there, so that is going to require - and I agree, there is a cost differential. I can also tell you, again this is facts - these are not to exceed based on today's assumptions. I can't assume that these prices may not, indeed, go up. And that's why we're trying to look at it from a discriminator standpoint of how you want to identify it. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MR. FIGUEROA: I think I need to go back and revisit how we're going to deal with this whole issue, because it is -- the price difference, $100 million, can make or break your mission. All right. So we need to come up with clearer guidance on how we're going to deal with that. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: Maybe it would help if you could define what you mean by "compatible". To give an example, let's say your point design uses the highest capability launch vehicle within a given class, and you have a certain launch margin on that vehicle. But if you were to use a less capable launch vehicle within the same class and the same cost, but had a much more degraded launch margin, would that be considered compatible?

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Again, the solution we're looking for is, how does Code S make a determination of overall best science, best mission risk? What we're trying to balance is, do you have viable proposals that can be met on Family A or Family B? That's what dual compatible is. It means that if one system goes down, there's an ability to fly on another, maybe a different class of configuration, but on the other system. So if Atlas disappears tomorrow, that the program and the mission can still be viable, because there is another solution, or vice versa. That's what the intent of dual compatible is. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MR. FIGUEROA: Do not interpret the fact that she used Atlas as an example as a --

MS. PONIATOWSKI: I could change the names if the configurations were different. And that's not across the Atlas family. They tend to have at any configuration, the way the vehicle is designed has that performance edge. There's no fuzz on it. It takes them, they can give you more before they need to move to a heavy configuration. That's an engineering issue, not a policy. And the only reason I used that example, is the other isn't the issue. If you're at a Delta IV heavy, you're not looking to go down. But that is a true statement, if you're at a Delta IV heavy, and Atlas goes away, then you've got to - or I should take that back. You're at a Delta IV heavy, and Delta goes away, you need to be compatible with what an Atlas V heavy would give you, so it works really both ways. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MR. FIGUEROA: Is it clear as mud? You know separately, there's an issue of what I'm going to call technical compatibility; which is between the two classes of families - not families, vendors.

MS. PONIATOWSKI: Vendors.

MR. FIGUEROA: Vendor providers. And then there is an issue that I already took an action on, on how are we going to deal with the potential difference in cost, in having to go to one or the other. Are we clear on both or not? ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

QUESTION: I think everybody understands the technical implications, but it was just how we were going to deal with cost that's still an open issue.

MR. FIGUEROA: So we are within days of posting them. However we decide to deal with this issue of cost difference, we'll make certain that the answer is fully compatible. ***[New Information Available as of 12/5/03; See NFPL Document #10, New Frontiers Launch Services Information Summary]***

MR. FIGUEROA: By the way, folks, so that you're clear, our job is to enable science. I mean, we don't want to penalize you as a community with the kinds of issues we're dealing with, so I will take those darned seriously. I can assure you of that. It's just a very difficult and uncertain environment we are in, that I wish was different, but it is what it is.

QUESTION: This question is in regard to the naming of the program manager in this phase of the procurement. Earlier AOs had that requirement, and then it was dropped because of the difficulty getting people to either commit who might not currently be working at the PI institution. And, therefore, it was allowed to just put in the qualifications that the PI would require in a program manager. This AO goes back to the old way of saying you want the name of the program manager now. Can you either give rationale, or are you willing to accept a description of what the program manager's expertise and capabilities should be? Can we at least talk and discuss that?

DR. MORGAN: I don't think we're willing to retreat from the AO as it stands now on that.

Dr. Morgan and Mr. Perry at this time read the written Questions and Answers that were available as of the PPC date. The current version of the written Questions and Answers is available via the New Frontiers Program Acquisition Home Page.

QUESTION: Carl Allen noted this morning the Sample Return Missions are a little different because much of the work begins when the sample returns. And I assume it is reasonable to budget that time, even though the space part of the mission has ended; that is, years after the samples come back, there's still work to be done by the science team in integrating the data.

DR. MORGAN: Well, the normal approach is to do a data analysis program.

QUESTION: But there's a science team in place that will have done preliminary analyses and so on.

DR. ALLEN: The one thing that we wrote in here was that the mission was to have a budget line covering curatorial activities for two years after the return of the sample. That was the only requirement that we put in place at this point. The requirements for a Data Analysis Program for participating scientists, et cetera, are outside the realm of curation. But we, in fact, did write in there that there had to be something, part of a mission budget that extended for two years after the actual return to earth of the spacecraft.